

April 23

ent Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of "greater stress on nonmilitary measures," and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets "will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high."

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator KEATING's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President he too would deal with Cuba by surveillance, containment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthroned and support the Emperor Maximilian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an ultimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of commonsense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischief-maker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermonuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

THE NEED FOR RESHAPING U.S. TRADE POLICY

(MR. REUSS *(at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in an article appearing in the forthcoming issue of Harper's magazine, I have appealed for an end to America's preoccupation with Europe and a redirection of our policy toward the broader goal of a free world community.

The text of the article follows:

AMERICA GETS AN UNEXPECTED BREAK

(By HENRY S. REUSS)

Instead of cursing De Gaulle, we ought to thank him for compelling us to reexamine the goals of our foreign policy. For the past 2 years we have uncritically supported the Common Market, although it was bound to impair free world trade by discriminating in favor of the insiders and their former colonies, and against those on the outside looking in.

Our vision was warped. For, in fact, since World War II our goal should have been nothing less than a community of the entire Free World. In such a community, the industrialized countries—Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and perhaps some others—would strive together for full employment and rapid growth within their own borders. They would also work toward the removal of trade barriers which separate them from each other and from the developing nations. And they would seek a mechanism of international exchange and payments which would avoid crises and permit each country to progress socially and economically. The industrialized countries would achieve full employment and at the same time provide their partners, the developing countries, with growing export markets and a dynamic source of public and private capital.

From time to time there have been glimmerings from official Washington that we were dedicated to such a large concept. But mostly we have been preoccupied with a particular view of Europe, centered on the Common Market. European regionalism should have been seen as merely a means to an end. Instead we have allowed it to become an end in itself. When Common Market policy collided with free world policy, the former nearly always won out.

Immediately after World War II it made sense to concentrate on rebuilding war-torn Europe as a step toward a free world community. We invented the Marshall plan. We encouraged regional institutions, such as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, the Coal-Steel Community, and Euratom. The Common Market of France, Italy, Germany, and the three Benelux countries (often called the Six) was part of this pattern.

In the beginning its entirely valid purpose was to strengthen the economies of its members by giving them a mass market and the

spur of competition. Another sound objective was the ending of animosity between France and Germany. These things have now been done.

Curiously, the most significant steps toward free world unity were taken in the immediate postwar period, when emphasis on Europe was amply justified by the need to fend off chaos. At Bretton Woods in 1945, we laid the foundation for a worldwide monetary order. In 1948 we convened the countries of the free world to establish the multilateral tariff-cutting procedures of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade known as GATT. With the point 4 program in the early 1950's, we gave direct aid to the developing nations. Those programs have not been matched by any comparable efforts since the midfifties. European regionalism has had top priority in our foreign policy. Ironically, as Europe came to need less of our concern and the free world more, we gave Europe more and more and the free world less. In effect, we turned our backs on the larger goals and, as a result, little progress toward them has been made since the promising postwar beginnings.

We knew, for example, that the free world needed a better system of international payments. But we were unwilling to go to France and other prosperous European countries and frankly ask for needed help. So we staggered along with monetary arrangements that have remained at best precarious.

Likewise we recognized that the developing countries needed economic assistance. But until very recently, we allowed the Europeans to drag their feet on foreign aid. And, although we paid lip service to the principle of multilateral, liberalized trade, we hailed the Common Market, with its obvious discriminatory features, as a great progressive step.

Strangely, hardly anyone questioned the assumptions that led to our single-minded concern with Europe. In the Great Non-Debate, few people pointed out that the Common Market was encouraging a European particularism rooted in the ancient dreams of unity of Charlemagne, Dante, and Henry IV, at just the time in history when speedy communications and the aspirations of rising peoples everywhere required a free world generalism.

THE DISHWASHER GAP

To understand how great a mistake this was, let us see just how the Common Market works, and who gets hurt.

First of all, we do. Unless our surplus of exports can be increased to offset our deficit items such as military expenditures overseas and investments abroad, we face continuing deficits in our balance of payments. Incomes are rising in the Common Market countries. They could be our fastest growing export area. But if the Common Market continues on its recent inward-looking course, we will lose rather than gain exports. The Common Market aims to insulate its members against the rest of the world with an external tariff averaging 11 percent and no tariff wall between its members. Such discrimination will hurt us.

Metal lathes provide a case in point. In 1958, the last pre-Common Market year, we exported \$1.5 million of metal lathes to Germany, and \$3 million to France. The German tariff was zero; the French tariff 11 percent. The Common Market external tariff is now 9 percent. The increase in the German tariff from zero to 9 percent is likely to cut us off from that market entirely. And the decrease in the French tariff from 11 to 9 percent is not likely to help us, since the Germans can ship their lathes into France duty-free. Thus even if Americans were to lead a Spartan life, keep wages and prices stable, and make admirable gains in productivity, our export possibilities to the Common Market could be largely gobbled up by its own members.

1963

To express their admiration and profound respect for a scholar so singularly blest, the president and trustees of Boston College have enrolled Nathan Marsh Pusey among our honorary alumni, and now proudly style him doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks a news story account of the Boston College's centennial convocation from the Boston Sunday Globe, by Ian Forman, including excerpts of the speeches of Father Walsh, Richard Carding Cushing, Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston, President Pusey, of Harvard University, and Gov. Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts:

CALLS FOR DECISION ON EDUCATION—20,000 HEAR J.F.K. AT BOSTON COLLEGE

(By Ian Forman)

President Kennedy, speaking at Boston College's centennial convocation Saturday, urged a "national decision in the national interest upon the national question of education."

In the sun-bright oval of Alumni Stadium, brilliantly filled with academic colors from many colleges and universities, he said before the 20,000 assembled:

"From the office I hold . . . there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America.

"That, of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education, as in education generally.

"It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here the pressing need for national attention and a national decision—in the national interest upon the national question of education," he said.

The President put an emphasis upon the word "national" each time he said it.

His own legislative program for Federal aid to education, both at higher and lower levels, is once again deadlocked on the horns of conflicting interests and groups for the third straight year.

Aside from the seriousness of his words, Mr. Kennedy looked relaxed and happy, refusing to put on his black academic cap, as he joined in the climactic event of Boston College's 100th anniversary celebration.

He recalled that the honorary doctor of laws degree which Boston College had conferred upon him in 1956 had made him, as he put it, "an instant alumnus."

He expressed pleasure that the president of his Harvard alma mater, Nathan M. Pusey, was being honored on this occasion with an honorary doctor of humane letters degree.

The President, tanned, his hair tousled by the stiff breeze, listed four ways in which "the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university."

The fourth point was that "these new requirements strengthen still further what has always been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to the Nation's service."

The phrase, he said, was Woodrow Wilson's and "no one has discussed its meaning better than what he said in 1896."

"It is not learning," he quoted Wilson as saying, "but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the annals of the Nation."

To Boston College, the President offered "renewed congratulations . . . in the confident hope that as her second century opens, Boston College will continue to respond—as she did in her beginnings—to the new needs of the age.

"Boston College," he said, "for 100 years has been 'of the Nation' (Wilson's phrase)—and so it will be for the next 100 years."

The setting for the centennial climax was bright and springy, with the fresh green turf of the stadium spreading a handsome carpet for the multicolored procession of gowned and capped representatives from 294 colleges and universities throughout the United States.

POSEY HAILS BOSTON COLLEGE

President Pusey of Harvard spoke for the other institutions on higher education in congratulating Boston College upon its 100th birthday.

"It is a joy," he said, "to see Boston College forging ahead in its accomplishments."

On a light note, Dr. Pusey added:

"May I as the president of an institution over 300 years old say this discouraging word to Father Walsh and his associates—that the tasks do not get easier as the centuries pass."

Boston College's 22d president in its first 100 years, Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., a scientist, conferred honorary degrees upon Dr. Pusey; Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson), British economist and author; and Very Rev. Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of Georgetown University, the oldest Jesuit university in the Nation, founded in 1789.

Lady Jackson was given an honorary Doctor of Letters and Father Bunn, an honorary Doctor of Laws.

In his own talk, Father Walsh said: "A university must span many centuries before it can be said to be old."

"And so, after only one century, it would be fitting to say that Boston College is still young."

"While we pay grateful and most respectful tribute to our past, our energies and our interests are directed to our future. We are impatient to move on with greater and firmer strides into our second century," he said.

Father Walsh paid tribute to Cardinal Cushing, an alumnus of Boston College, Class of 1917, saying: ". . . at one our most benevolent father and devoted son, our welcome is what it has always been, one of gratitude and deepest affection."

Cardinal Cushing, in his remarks, replied: "For what Boston College has done, is doing and will continue to do for God and for country, for Church and for State, for the education world and for the common good, we are thankful today."

Governor Peabody, who brought the good wishes of the Commonwealth, said:

"All of us who are working for better education opportunities here in Massachusetts can take heart from the accomplishments of Boston College. For education is one of this Commonwealth's most precious assets."

ENCYCICAL PRAISED

In addition, the President's brother, 31-year-old Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, walked in academic dress beside his senior colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, in his Harvard cap and gown.

President Kennedy, in his address, also commented upon "the remarkable encyclicals, *pacem in terris*" which Pope John issued last week.

"As a Catholic I am proud of it, and as an American I have learned from it," he said.

"It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths—as in recent documents of the World Council of Churches—and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing.

"We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed.

"It seems reasonable to hope that a similar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of the higher learning," he said.

The President also cited the other ways in which the universities must help meet the "new realities of our day."

They are in helping the nation understand the world which "has come to our doorstep;" to continue the explosion of knowledge which "in some fields seems so fast, in others distressingly slow;" and to act as interpreter "as the world presses in, and knowledge presses out."

ROGERS CITES NEW FIGURES IN CUBAN SHIPPING

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the period from April 6 to 19, a total of six more ships flying the flags of our allies called in Communist Cuba. Five of these were British, one of which was an 11,182-ton tanker. Another was of Lebanese registry.

A total of 56 allied vessels have called in Cuba since January 1. Such trade is an affront to the United States and the entire hemisphere. Again I urge our Government to close its ports to all nations engaged in sea trade with Communist Cuba.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CUBAN POLICY IS RIGHT AND HAS GROWING SUPPORT

(Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's Cuban policy is basically correct and right and has growing support.

Walter Lippmann in his column of April 23, 1963, in the Washington, D.C. Post, declared that the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator Keating before the meeting last week of the American Society of Newspaper Editors was that: There is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do.

It is interesting that Governor Rockefeller and former Republican Vice President Richard Nixon have become almost singlehandedly "the war party."

I include the text of Walter Lippmann's penetrating article entitled "The Kennedy-Keating Cuban Policy."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 23, 1963]

THE KENNEDY-KEATING CUBAN POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator Keating was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator Keating, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that "it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem." He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our pres-

to extend revolution by violence in Latin America. He said that he did not deny the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism, but it had not been possible in Cuba nor anywhere else in Latin America yet. Few statements could be more explicit.

Prize-Winning Orations by Two Oklahoma College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include prize-winning orations by John Gilpin and Joe Dollins, representing two outstanding colleges in my district, Southeastern State College at Durant, Okla., and Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College at Wilburton, Okla., respectively.

The orations follow:

OUR DIVIDED WORLD

(By John Gilpin, Southeastern State College, Durant, Okla.)

The world, the whole world has never before been so completely divided because it has never before been so completely united. The obstacles which for years have prevented the close contact of men and nations have fallen to modern technology. Within a generation mankind has come to the threshold of unification and polarization. The human race has become a seamless whole, in which the murder of a Congolese chieftain sets off reverberations in the centers of world power thousands of miles away. And every day the whole is cut more deeply into two hostile halves.

But this division and conflict is not limited to our globe—for in the past 10 years outer space has become a field of competition between the two ideologies that divide the world. President Kennedy warned us of the danger of falling behind Russia after the single orbit flight of Russian Maj. Yuri Gagarin in 1961. The United States was still lagging behind when another Russian astronaut completed 17 orbits a few months later. But the United States regained a sensational amount of this loss when Col. John Glenn orbited around the earth three times in February 1962.

These successes intensified a race between the United States and Russia that will cost America and Russia over \$30 billion apiece in the next few years.

But these billions of dollars involved in the space race represent only a small part of the divided world's burden. The divided world so nearly united is also a poor world so nearly rich. Never before in the history of mankind has the possibility of a decent life for men everywhere been so real, yet it is so far away. Because as long as the deadly struggle between the East and the West is continued we can never hope to concentrate any of our effort on the homeless and starving people of the world.

Each day the struggle continues, the division is deepened. The entire world is being drawn into the division. Increasing pressure is being put on the neutrals from both sides. And the more they resist the greater the pressure becomes. They are beginning to realize that they must choose, and the choice will be final, between the East or the West.

This division of the world into two hostile halves is not new, in fact it is as old as history itself. But the known world was only

a very small part of the world at the time of Greece and Persia, Athens and Sparta, Rome and Carthage. But nevertheless there has always been a divided world of the rich and the poor, of those who owned and those who toiled. Plato echoed this theory in one of his works when he said that the city of the rich and the city of the poor would always be at war with each other.

The present world division may well be attributed to the attitudes accepted by the United States and Russia immediately after the Second World War. No historian places the entire blame for this division at the door of the Russians. Rightly or wrongly, a long string of provocations has been pointed at the Americans, the British, and the French in the partition of Germany. Regardless of this it is probable that a few weeks after the bombing of Hiroshima the Soviet Union would still have seen in the United States its mortal enemy. The United States was the genuinely successful capitalistic society, and America was now capable of producing a unique power for making war. More than that, the United States was now the only mainstay of the old capitalist empires.

Soon after the war the Communists returned to their goal of world revolution. They returned to the tactics laid down by their forefathers, Lenin and Marx, and they began their ruthless sweep through Eastern Europe. This reminded Western leadership of the revival of Communist imperialism. The violently reawakened Russian nationalism played upon the postwar chaos to create a buffer zone to defend the Soviet Union against the West. Also the West began to see the real picture of international communism and its aims.

The age-old theory of keeping a balance of power is out. Up to now it was accepted belief that maintaining a marginal balance of power over your enemy was sufficient. The new doctrine calls for absolute, and not marginal supremacy over your enemy. We must have this supreme edge over the Communists if we hope to contain the Russians in their present area, while maintaining our position at the pinnacle of world power. We started this policy 16 years ago and we are still following it today.

The United States will continue to strive for peace. But we are not alone in this task, the Communists since the end of World War II have been professing their desire for world peace. Of course, the objective of the Russians are much different than those of the United States. There is a popular anecdote in Washington and Moscow going around concerning this uneasy peace we are now in. A holy man was asked to inquire of God if there would be a war. After a suitable interval the holy man said he had done so and had been told by the Lord: "There will be no war, but the struggle for peace will be so furious that there shall not be left one stone upon another."

But I would ask: How can there be peace with two such colossal forces standing face to face in the world with nothing to restrain them? Never before in history has there been peace in a situation such as this.

While Hiroshima burned, President Truman told us "there must never be another war." War, at last, has become too horrible. But is peace humanly possible? Why not? Warring families have become tribal communities, warring tribes have become villages and then cities, and these city-states have been formed into nations. And in the last generation nations have combined into international communities. Within these large social organizations peace has always been the rule and war, revolutionary or civil war, the exception. There have been struggles between classes, races, and parties, but the community has always survived. Why then should there not be a community of the world within which violence could be

restrained as the national community. Although it would be extremely idealistic to contend that the world in its present condition could ever unite, isn't the only hope for world peace going to exist in world unification?

The dream of a world community is not new to men. In fact, the idea is as old as history itself. In early Grecian history the city-states of Athens and Sparta warred against each other for the power to rule over the known world. Later because of the influence of an outside force these nations united for mutual protection. As these nations, and other nations throughout history, have seen the need for unification we today must also realize this need.

Must man be made one before the world can be made one? This question is answered in the outstanding novel "The Brothers Karamazov" when its leading character says, "To transform the world, to re-create it afresh, men must turn into another path psychologically. Until you have become really, in actual fact, a brother to everyone, brotherhood will not come to pass. No sort of scientific teaching, no kind of common interest, will ever teach men to share."

MY UNCONQUERABLE SOUL

(By Joe Dollins, Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Wilburton, Okla.)

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever Gods may be,
For my unconquerable soul."

With these words, William Ernest Henley asserts his freedom. Freedom not from physical bondage, but rather mental enslavement. He magnifies the thought, "individuality is freedom lived."

The initiative of individuals granted, not gave, literally gave to us the freedom under which we live. Why then doesn't individual initiative characterize our present day society?

I wonder what has happened to the bold American. You know, "give me liberty or give me death." When Patrick Henry made this familiar statement, I think he pleaded not only for his country, but also for himself. Perhaps that's just it. Because Patrick Henry and other men like him knew the horror of not having freedom of thought, they fought and gave this freedom to us.

Why don't we use this freedom? I think it's because like I said, others gave it to us; we haven't had to fight for it, therefore, we don't fully appreciate the privilege that is ours.

Justice Stanley Reed made the statement, "Without freedom of thought, there can be no free society." Since great individuals have given this freedom to us, I would say, "Without utilization of this freedom of thought, a free society cannot be maintained."

People, not individuals, but people say that the growing social pressure smothers their personality. That is a person's good reason for not being an individual, but their real reason is that they find under pressure, conformity is easier than individuality. What if Dorothea Dix had yielded to the conformed idea of the public toward mental illness? Where would our Nation be today if Mr. John F. Kennedy hadn't taken his firm stand on the Cuban crisis last October? As Emerson puts it, "Who so would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

The Creator seems to have given different people different ways of apprehending reality. Different personalities possess different insight into matters. This is the reason we as individuals must assert our view and be creative in the manner for which we were created, not conform to the activity for which a separate being was molded. A teacher of philosophy said it this way, "God created

1963

RECORD include the following proclamation by the Governor of Florida.

I am glad to have this included as follows:

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF FLORIDA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, TALLAHASSEE

Whereas the written word serves as the fuel to feed the burning flame of inquiring minds; and

Whereas the libraries of Florida present for many of her citizens the doorway to knowledge, adventure and entertainment and as a stimulus for creativity and competence in a variety of fields; and

Whereas the development of libraries in Florida is of broad concern, at the highest levels of State government to the smallest communities served by regional library systems; and

Whereas interested citizens can make substantial contributions to the future development of libraries in Florida by their active interest in local planning, and participation in the support of libraries by service in such organizations as Friends of the Library: Now, therefore, I, Farris Bryant, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim April 21-27, 1963, as Library Week in Florida, and urge all citizens to visit their local libraries during this period to draw there upon the reservoir of knowledge, the magic of imagination and the enjoyment of a well-told story, that only the world of books can make available.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 29th day of January, A.D. 1963.

Attest:

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.
TOM ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

Berlin, Cuba Test Ban All Doing Poorly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 the Wall Street Journal carried a column by William Henry Chamberlin which assessed present performance of the Kennedy administration on three important issues as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1963]
FRUSTRATION — FORMULA: ADMINISTRATION MIXES TIMIDITY ON CUBA, UNREALISM ON ATOM TEST BAN, WEST BERLIN

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The word "frustration" frequently appears in dispatches from Washington at the present time.

The Kennedy administration probably reached the height of its prestige in foreign affairs when it faced down Nikita Khrushchev on the issue of withdrawing the missiles which had been stealthily installed in Cuba.

Since that time, however, much has gone wrong from the standpoint of American foreign policy. General de Gaulle, by vetoing British admission to the European Economic Community and insisting on his national nuclear deterrent, tossed a monkey wrench into administration plans for closer Western defense and trade coordination. Soviet troops have remained in Cuba, emphasizing

a clear breach of the Monroe Doctrine. The fragile agreement for the neutralization of Laos is beginning to fray around the edges.

Some of these disappointments are due to factors beyond the control or anticipation of the administration. But on three issues, at least, the United States has been pursuing policies based on questionable premises and therefore inviting failure and frustration.

First, there is the attempt to reach an agreement banning nuclear tests at almost any price. This might be justified if it could be assumed (a) that the Soviet Union would observe any such agreement and (b) that the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers would thereby be stopped. On any coolheaded survey of the situation, in the light of past experience, both these assumptions seem most improbable.

BROKEN TREATIES

It would be superfluous to recite the long list of Soviet broken treaties and agreements. One need only recall the unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing which began in October 1958, and dragged on until the end of August 1961, when it was unilaterally denounced by the Soviet Government, although Khrushchev had solemnly affirmed earlier that the Soviet Union would never be the first to resume nuclear testing. It is difficult to estimate how much the United States lost by denying itself the advantages of research while the Soviet Union, at the very least, was preparing for new tests.

Nor is there any reason to believe that an American-Soviet agreement would stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Is there any reason to believe General de Gaulle would cease and desist from his development of French nuclear power merely because an American-Soviet agreement had been signed? Would Red China, visibly on the outs with Khrushchev, heed a request from him to stop its nuclear development?

Second, there is an obvious disadvantage about the talks on West Berlin which have just been resumed. There could be no objection to raising, as a serious potential threat to peace, the unnatural partition of Germany. But a discussion limited to West Berlin places the United States before the awkward alternative of making unilateral concessions or refusing any change in the present situation.

THWARTING ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

Third, some aspects of our policy, or lack of policy, toward Cuba since the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles are timid, self-contradictory and calculated to raise the question whether our diplomatic victory in Cuba last October was as complete as it seemed.

We have all but renounced any intention to use our own forces in an invasion of Cuba. No one in his senses would like to see a repetition of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Both as Senator and as President, Mr. Kennedy has expressed the hope that the Cuban people will rise to vindicate their freedom. The implication would seem to be that the American Government, through properly covert channels, should extend all feasible aid to the anti-Castro Cubans.

By announcing a crackdown on the activities of such groups we are making our avowed objective look ridiculous and creating doubt as to the steadfastness of our will and purpose among our friends in countries threatened by Castroite propaganda and subversive activity. Successful guerrilla movements have always depended on support from without. The Algerian nationalist bands that eroded French rule in that country would, in all probability, never have succeeded if they had not received a steady supply of arms from across their frontiers.

It is unlikely that boycotts and other forms of economic pressure will bring down the Castro regime so long as all the re-

sources of the Soviet bloc are mobilized to prop him up, and many of our NATO allies refuse to join in the boycott of Cuba. To give Castro the protection of our Armed Forces while proclaiming his downfall as our objective is a policy of sorry confusion.

Talks that lead nowhere and are unlikely to lead anywhere and policies that are self-contradictory furnish an excellent formula for frustration.

Castro
The Violent Revolutionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial entitled "The Violent Reactionaries" appearing in the April 20, 1963, issue of the Trinidad Guardian came to my attention.

I think this editorial sums up in a concise manner what may be expected from Castro's protected sanctuary in regard to the promulgation of communism in the Latin American countries.

The editorial follows:

[From the Trinidad Guardian, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE VIOLENT REVOLUTIONARIES

It is never easy for an outsider to get hold of the true facts behind a revolution in a Latin American country. Indeed, it is probably not easy for the average citizen in these countries to understand fully what is going on. This particularly applies to present-day Argentina, with its recurrent bids by various persons and groups to seize power. We are accustomed to seeing generals and admirals at the head of these bids, but we have now been told about a different element seeking to gain power—writers, diplomats, and politicians who belong to a "Latin American type of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement."

We have commented before on the stepped-up campaign now being conducted by Communist bloc countries to spread subversion in Latin America. But, so far as we know, this is the first time the Argentine Government has openly stated that a Communist, or a Communist-type organization was about to make a bid to gain power. This substantiates recent reports and rumors that Castro's regime in Cuba, doubtless acting on instructions from both Moscow and Peking, is giving increased support to many leftwing extremists all over Latin America who are working to bring down their governments by violent action.

A recent BBC talk had some interesting things to say, for example, about what has been going on in Ecuador. There is apparently an organization there called "The Revolutionary Youth Movement," which is dedicated to using violence to take over the Government. As long ago as 1960 Castro was made its honorary president, and he has supplied it with weapons, money, and propaganda material. Several of its members have been trained in Cuba in guerrilla tactics. In January, this year, a police raid on its headquarters discovered firearms and material for making bombs.

The "writing on the wall" could hardly be clearer. But, if further clarification is needed, it is to be found in a speech made by Castro to the Congress of the Women of the Americas in Havana in January. He categorically stated then that he was determined to encourage every movement aiming

The Ugly Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert A. Stanton, industrialist, merchant, and philanthropist of the 11th Congressional District of California, wrote the following essay on "The Ugly Communist" which I am sure will meet with a favorable response from all Members of Congress:

THE UGLY COMMUNIST

The picture of the "Ugly American" has been accepted in many quarters as typical of our diplomatic deficiencies. It is time we made a careful study of Communist methods and the technique of Soviet propaganda, so that the "Ugly Communist" is exposed in his own true light. It should be required study, by our diplomats, in our schools and colleges, so that we may better meet our competition in the battle of ideologies. The following notes were taken from careful studies of the "Forces for Communism."

Like all political systems whose appeal is not based on reason, Communist totalitarianism moves ahead less on the conviction of its members than on the confusion of its opponents. Communist Parties are merely firebrands, and the main effort of the Kremlin is to pervert or weaken the fabric it sticks them into. That is the governing idea behind active minorities which bolshevism put in theory and into practice from its inception. It has always won power—especially in the U.S.S.R. and China—with parties very much in the minority, but in undermined and deluded society.

Furthermore, the aim for years has no longer been to promote communism as an ideology, but to further the international game of the Soviet state. It is therefore a dangerous illusion to think that a country is safe because its Communist Party is weak, if pro-Soviet views meet with a wide response.

Trade unions are an infiltration area aimed at by Bolshevism for the longest time, concerning which Lenin, in the "Childhood Disease of Communism" wrote the following, which can stand as an epigraph to all Soviet infiltration, and if the free world does not take heed, as an epitaph on its own tomb:

"We must learn how to make use of all stratagems, of ruse, adopt illegal methods, keep silent at times, conceal the truth, with the sole aim of getting into the unions, staying there, and accomplishing the task of communism there in spite of everything."

It can be said that the whole edifice of Soviet propaganda is built on the pyramid of secret factions. The leaders at the top of each CP can be a faction for infiltrating the party. The party itself constitutes a faction for infiltrating parallel organizations. Parallel organizations are factions for infiltrating the whole society. From top to bottom prevails the governing idea of Bolshevism, which is to subject a majority without cohesion to a well-knit minority. Why not use this technique to influence new nations toward freedom—not a peace army only, but a freedom army?

Soviet diplomacy is not diplomacy in the usual sense of the term. It is another one of the principal spheres of Soviet propaganda. Every form of exchange between Communist and other countries, whether diplomatic, cultural, commercial, technical,

or athletic, is conceived and worked out with propaganda in mind—not of course open propaganda for communism, but propaganda of an indirect, enveloping, underhanded kind for pro-Soviet views. All members of Soviet missions abroad are trained primarily to charm and lull to sleep high political or financial circles in the countries they are to undermine.

Soviets also derive a considerable propaganda advantage from organized visits of delegations and prominent people whom they invite to the countries they dominate. Under the guise of information and goodwill tours, an enormous machine of hoax and perversion is hidden. The operation of this machine has become a real industry. In the U.S.S.R. and China it employs tens of thousands of people full time.

Regarding radio broadcasts, this propaganda channel is too well known to need emphasizing. We shall only remark that in this sphere where the United States has made an exceptional effort, the Soviets still surpass them by a ratio of 4 to 1 in broadcasting time.

The various forms of Communist propaganda throughout the world involve a personnel of about 500,000 and an annual expenditure of approximately \$2 billion.

This effort is made to circumvent about 1 milliard (1 billion) people outside the Communist orbit, so that it can be said that Moscow (with slight aid from Peiping) spends \$2 a year per freeman to be subjugated. To grasp the magnitude of this figure expressing the scope of the political war Moscow wages against us, we should remark that an American Senate committee has estimated the sums allocated by the United States to world propaganda at 1 1/4 cents per person a year. If the budgets of all other free countries are added to the total it hardly comes to 2 cents.

On this point the Soviet effort is roughly 100 times as great as that of the rest of the world, and thus it is a phenomenon of an entirely different nature. In fact, the Communist and para-Communist propaganda apparatus is a colossus unique in kind and scope, in human history. That is one essential truth about communism which must be always borne in mind.

The motive power of this fantastic machine is money, drawn from overexploitation of enslaved toiling masses under the Communist yoke. These masses work to exhaustion for absurdly low wages to enable their masters not only to dominate them the better, but also to deceive more successfully the toiling masses in free countries.

With regard to the role of money, it should be emphasized how unworthy it is for professedly rational thinkers to pretend to innocence, and belief in miracles where communism is concerned, while refusing to admit that the sympathy of many freemen for so ruthless a tyranny as Moscow's can only be explained by corruption.

Propaganda spreads the terms; it is the organization that maintains the epidemic. Organization is to propaganda what the factory is to science. A Communist is the bourgeois of organization as the capitalist was the bourgeois of manufacturing.

Strange as it may seem, a third motive force behind Soviet propaganda—and not the least—is the eagerness of the free world's press to respond to it without charge. With their love of sensation, their search for exciting news, their need to sell, their naivete about Soviet tricks and lies, they repeat a number of these tricks and lies of their own free will, without even having to be induced to do so by the auxiliaries that infiltrate them. There is no limit to their falsehood and duplicity. That Bolshevism has attained to absolute falsehood is apparent from its basic position, for it promises total liberation and organizes total enslavement.

Not much thought has been given in the West to the fact that for the first time in history a political system has actually been built on 100 percent lies, with the other characteristic that lying is practiced ostentatiously. The strong point of this excess is that it saturates and wearies mistrust. Free men living in a world where a minimum of good faith is observed (if only because political rivalry prevents one side from carrying a falsehood too far since the other can unmask it) simply cannot believe that falsehood can reach this point.

The notion that the U.S.S.R. is a power "like the others" in its international behavior caters to intellectual laziness because it eliminates the necessity of giving special treatment to Soviet ways. And that yields the Kremlin substantial profits, for it induces Western leaders to believe that with the Soviets a conference, a treaty, a minister, when actually the Kremlin dictatorship has turned them respectively into a trap, a rag, a menial.

The Kremlin, now much more colonialist and imperialist than the West, plays on the uneasy conscience that the past faults of the West created in western public opinion.

It plays on the traditional pacifism of this public opinion to make all firmness to look like war mongering.

It plays on liberal circles concern for objectivity to incite neutralism on the pretext of striking a balance between America's faults and those of the U.S.S.R., when it is impossible to be neutral between the camp of freedom and the camp of slavery.

Many of the successes of Soviet propaganda are due not to conviction, but to fear. The Kremlin displays its power to the maximum and even displays more than it actually has. In this way it develops a concession reflex among the masses, and gets a great many prominent persons to go over to its side, in the belief that in case of victory such a power will be ruthless to its opponents, which no risk is run in berating the Western camp, considering its tolerance.

Communist propaganda pounces on every bone of contention that divides the free world and embitters conflicts at will. It drums up our national ideological and economic rivalries.

We are faced with a conflict between two "blocs," the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America and since the question is only one of rivalry between interests, inducing uninvolved countries to believe they can stand aside and therefore remain neutral. Yet the conflict is neither rational nor economic. It does not take place between two empires nor between socialism and capitalism. Whatever opinion one may hold on these two systems, it is clear that the rulers of the Kremlin hate socialism as much as capitalism when appearing in a democratic form. For it cannot bear on its flank the presence of a free society whose way of life dissolves the Soviet armature of lies and fascinates its fettered subject. It is because the West personifies democracy that the U.S.S.R. wants to crush it.

The conflict is then between freedom and dictatorship, between humanistic open-society civilization and despotic closed tribe systems. That is the reason why minds even more than territory are at stake. That is the reason why it concerns every man, at every corner of the earth. If bloc is to mean the the totality of threatened nations, then the term must be widened to cover the whole of our free world, not limited to the United States. And in this whole the most directly coveted part today is Europe and Asia, not America.

The truth is that to resist Soviet propaganda the most urgent thing is aid, not to underdeveloped countries, but to underdeveloped minds, in the West as well as in the East.

armchair asserting that they will not accept it.

I should not close this long answer to a brief question without pointing out that there is—and will be—no foolproof verification system, manned or unmanned, or both. We should nevertheless, I suggest, accept the marginal risks that remain, should the Russians accept a system which our experts consider effective. These risks seem to me far smaller than those involved in continuation of the arms race.

Who would enforce disarmament?

This question raises the issue of world government. Would not an international police force strong enough to maintain disarmament—to protect the disarmed nations from a violator—require an executive authority to give it orders? And who would that be? Would there not have to be global law for this body to enforce, and would not this law have to be enacted by a world legislature? And would the U.S.S.R. and the United States ever agree to submit themselves to such a world government?

Here one has to distinguish carefully between the short and the long run. In the short run, such international institutions are not a necessary requirement for the initiation of disarmament. The two blocs could check on each other to satisfy themselves that commitments are fulfilled. Britons and Canadians, for instance, could verify Russian arms reduction for the West, and Poles verify American arms reduction for the East. Differences of opinion could be brought for arbitration before a panel of "wise men," selected by both sides from among men known throughout the world for their integrity—as U Thant is, for example. Even an "international" police force could be initiated on a two-bloc or three-bloc basis.

In the long run, stronger international institutions might develop. Once the arms race was reversed, once the cold war barriers of suspicion were shattered, many possibilities now viewed as unlikely would open up. Few expected that Japan and Germany would become intimate allies of the United States; that Germany and France, after three generations of hostility, would enter into an intimate union; that Soviet Russia and Communist China would come into bitter and open conflict. An international police force seems now as unlikely, and might be just as possible.

The road toward disarmament is not without risk, and the development of effective international organizations is far from guaranteed. Those who support disarmament can only state that they prefer to take those risks over those involved in the continuation of the arms race. I belong to a large group of people in the West who want peace but not appeasement, disarmament but not communism. It is true that some members of the peace movement are appeasers or worse; but will we close our hearts to a world with its waiting megaton graves, just because a few abuse our concern for the survival of our lives and our values, and are willing to trade the one for the other?

Scientists Link Smog to Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article, which appeared in the Valley

Times Today on Thursday, April 18, 1963. This is one of many fine newspapers in the 27th Congressional District in California. I have been very interested in the menace that air pollution, better known in Los Angeles as smog, has on the health of the people throughout the whole United States. The following article spells out this menace as it has to do with cancer:

SCIENTISTS LINK SMOG TO CANCER

Smog causes changes in human lung cells similar to early stages of cancer, according to scientists at the Pasadena Foundation for Medical Research.

Dr. Donald E. Rounds, Dr. C. M. Pomerat and coworkers said Wednesday they have found the first scientific evidence indicating "there are sufficient carcinogens—cancer-causing chemicals—in the atmosphere to trigger the initial steps toward malignancy." "We can't say we caused malignancy," the scientists said in describing how they exposed human lung cells to smog, "but we can say the changes in the cells were nearly identical to changes when carcinogens are used."

The Pasadena scientists first exposed human tissue to a chemical used routinely by laboratories for causing cancer. Then they recorded on motion picture film the changes in the cells which were triggered by the cancer-causing chemical.

The photographs showed the growth rate was increased and that the cell chromosomes, the carriers of hereditary material, underwent abnormal changes.

Having established the nature of the changes caused by a chemical known to cause cancer, the scientists repeated the experiment with fresh cells but this time exposed them to Pasadena air on smoggy days.

Rounds said the growth rate and the chromosome abnormality were nearly identical to those appearing in the first experiment.

Cuba

How Indispensable Was U.N. in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Ed Delaney appearing in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, April 16, 1963.

It is high time that the American public realizes that the foreign affairs of this country are being determined by the United Nations which has no interest whatsoever in the preservation of the free world or of this Republic:

HOW INDISPENSABLE WAS U.N. IN CUBA?

(By Ed Delaney)

According to Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations, that Red-riddled organization was never so "indispensable as it was in the Cuban crisis." Bunche made that statement in an address at Chapman College, Orange, and added that due to the statesmanship of President Kennedy in submitting the problem to the U.N. "we were afforded an opportunity to achieve a solution." What solution? If the U.N.'s meddling in the Cuban crisis is all they can offer to justify its existence, then we can dispense with the U.N. now, and good riddance.

With much publicity U Thant, Secretary General of the U.N., went to Cuba, embraced

Castro and informed him that the U.N. wanted to make an inspection to ascertain the facts about the missile bases that were or had been in Cuba. Castro said "No." U Thant flew back to the U.N. Temple of Hypocrisy on Manhattan Island and related his interview with Castro. It was the unilateral action of President Kennedy, without consulting the U.N. or any of the Western Allies, that halted the Soviet buildup in Cuba. To credit the U.N. with any part in averting a crisis in Cuba at that time is typical of those, such as Bunche, who are professional propagandists for the U.N.

He said also that no war was waged by the U.N. in Katanga. That is deliberate falsification of the known and published facts. On February 12, 1962, another apologist for the U.N., Carl T. Rowan, of the State Department endeavored to convince a Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate that the U.N. had not engaged in wanton massacre of the people in Katanga. The committee chairman, Senator THOMAS DOBBS, Democrat, of Connecticut, cut Rowan short with the assertion, "I can tell you that there has been slaughter of people in Katanga and elsewhere and it had been public knowledge." Rowan endeavored to hem-and-haw but knew Senator Dobbs had been in Katanga and the Congo, where he made personal investigation of the situation.

But the U.N. supporters, such as Ralph Bunche, endeavor to impress their audiences with the importance of the U.N. and to ridicule all who denounce its deceptions and acts of aggression. It is the John Birchers, the sick-minded, the isolationists, and stupid people who decry the noble and lofty ideals of the U.N. according to Ralph Bunche and coworkers.

It is matter of public record that President Moise Tshombe of Katanga stated in December 1961: "The United States is furnishing planes which are transporting men and materials to bomb our cities and villages and slaughter our people, planes which fly the U.N. flag. Indian soldiers are indiscriminately killing civilians."

As recently as March 14, 1963, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cites a report by Archbishop Joseph Cornelius, of Elisabethville, Katanga, which "confirms the cruelty of the killing of Katangese civilians. A girl was violated and bayoneted in the stomach, also two others killed. Seventy corpses were brought to Prince Leopold Hospital. All this was done by the Ethiopians." As Columnist William S. White summed up: "The ugly truth is that deceit and evasiveness and incredible arrogance have marked the U.N.'s course in the Congo from first to last."

There are copious, indisputable records of how the U.N. waged war against Katanga without the slightest legal or moral justification. But Tshombe was anti-Communist and pro-Western, so he had to be destroyed and his country subjected to U.N. dictates because Moscow decreed it. The records also show that as far back as 1958 Ralph Bunche praised "the principles of equality and humanitarianism of the Soviet Union." We witnessed the manner in which those principles were displayed in Katanga.

More inaccuracies of Bunche: the U.N. has achieved much since the admission of the African states into that organization, he said. What has it accomplished? Those so-called states have no stable governments, no knowledge of how to make profitable use of what natural resources they have. They are mendicants in every sense of the word, barnacles on European or American economy. Without financial and technical aid from Europe or America they will revert to the primitive state in which they were before being developed by non-Africans. The United States pays 47 percent of the cost of the Congo operations. Heaven speed the day when we may get the United States out of the U.N. and get the U.N. out of the United States.

RECORD include the following proclamation by the Governor of Florida.

I am glad to have this included as follows:

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF FLORIDA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, TALLAHASSEE

Whereas the written word serves as the fuel to feed the burning flame of inquiring minds; and

Whereas the libraries of Florida present for many of her citizens the doorway to knowledge, adventure and entertainment and as a stimulus for creativity and competence in a variety of fields; and

Whereas the development of libraries in Florida is of broad concern, at the highest levels of State government to the smallest communities served by regional library systems; and

Whereas interested citizens can make substantial contributions to the future development of libraries in Florida by their active interest in local planning, and participation in the support of libraries by service in such organizations as Friends of the Library: Now, therefore, I, Farris Bryant, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim April 21-27, 1963, as Library Week in Florida, and urge all citizens to visit their local libraries during this period to draw there upon the reservoir of knowledge, the magic of imagination and the enjoyment of a well-told story, that only the world of books can make available.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 29th day of January, A.D. 1963.

Attest:

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.
TOM ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

Berlin, Cuba, Test Ban All Doing Poorly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 the Wall Street Journal carried a column by William Henry Chamberlin which assessed present performance of the Kennedy administration on three important issues as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1963]

FRUSTRATION FORMULA: ADMINISTRATION MIXES TIMIDITY ON CUBA, UNREALISM ON ATOM TEST BAN, WEST BERLIN

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The word "frustration" frequently appears in dispatches from Washington at the present time.

The Kennedy administration probably reached the height of its prestige in foreign affairs when it faced down Nikita Khrushchev on the issue of withdrawing the missiles which had been stealthily installed in Cuba.

Since that time, however, much has gone wrong from the standpoint of American foreign policy. General de Gaulle, by vetoing British admission to the European Economic Community and insisting on his national nuclear deterrent, tossed a monkey wrench into administration plans for closer Western defense and trade coordination. Soviet troops have remained in Cuba, emphasizing

a clear breach of the Monroe Doctrine. The fragile agreement for the neutralization of Laos is beginning to fray around the edges.

Some of these disappointments are due to factors beyond the control or anticipation of the administration. But on three issues, at least, the United States has been pursuing policies based on questionable premises and therefore inviting failure and frustration.

First, there is the attempt to reach an agreement banning nuclear tests at almost any price. This might be justified if it could be assumed (a) that the Soviet Union would observe any such agreement and (b) that the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers would thereby be stopped. On any coolheaded survey of the situation, in the light of past experience, both these assumptions seem most improbable.

BROKEN TREATIES

It would be superfluous to recite the long list of Soviet broken treaties and agreements. One need only recall the unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing which began in October 1958, and dragged on until the end of August 1961, when it was unilaterally denounced by the Soviet Government, although Khrushchev had solemnly affirmed earlier that the Soviet Union would never be the first to resume nuclear testing. It is difficult to estimate how much the United States lost by denying itself the advantages of research while the Soviet Union, at the very least, was preparing for new tests.

Nor is there any reason to believe that an American-Soviet agreement would stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Is there any reason to believe General de Gaulle would cease and desist from his development of French nuclear power merely because an American-Soviet agreement had been signed? Would Red China, visibly on the outs with Khrushchev, heed a request from him to stop its nuclear development?

Second, there is an obvious disadvantage about the talks on West Berlin which have just been resumed. There could be no objection to raising, as a serious potential threat to peace, the unnatural partition of Germany. But a discussion limited to West Berlin places the United States before the awkward alternative of making unilateral concessions or refusing any change in the present situation.

THWARTING ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

Third, some aspects of our policy, or lack of policy, toward Cuba since the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles are timid, self-contradictory and calculated to raise the question whether our diplomatic victory in Cuba last October was as complete as it seemed.

We have all but renounced any intention to use our own forces in an invasion of Cuba. No one in his senses would like to see a repetition of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Both as Senator and as President, Mr. Kennedy has expressed the hope that the Cuban people will rise to vindicate their freedom. The implication would seem to be that the American Government, through properly covert channels, should extend all feasible aid to the anti-Castro Cubans.

By announcing a crackdown on the activities of such groups we are making our avowed objective look ridiculous and creating doubt as to the steadfastness of our will and purpose among our friends in countries threatened by Castro's propaganda and subversive activity. Successful guerrilla movements have always depended on support from without. The Algerian nationalist bands that eroded French rule in that country would, in all probability, never have succeeded if they had not received a steady supply of arms from across their frontiers.

It is unlikely that boycotts and other forms of economic pressure will bring down the Castro regime so long as all the re-

sources of the Soviet bloc are mobilized to prop him up, and many of our NATO allies refuse to join in the boycott of Cuba. To give Castro the protection of our Armed Forces while proclaiming his downfall as our objective is a policy of sorry confusion.

Talks that lead nowhere and are unlikely to lead anywhere and policies that are self-contradictory furnish an excellent formula for frustration.

The Violent Revolutionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial entitled "The Violent Reactionaries" appearing in the April 20, 1963, issue of the *Trinidad Guardian* came to my attention.

I think this editorial sums up in a concise manner what may be expected from Castro's protected sanctuary in regard to the promulgation of communism in the Latin American countries.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Trinidad Guardian*, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE VIOLENT REVOLUTIONARIES

It is never easy for an outsider to get hold of the true facts behind a revolution in a Latin American country. Indeed, it is probably not easy for the average citizen in these countries to understand fully what is going on. This particularly applies to present-day Argentina, with its recurrent bids by various persons and groups to seize power. We are accustomed to seeing generals and admirals at the head of these bids, but we have now been told about a different element seeking to gain power—writers, diplomats, and politicians who belong to a "Latin American type of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement."

We have commented before on the stepped-up campaign now being conducted by Communist bloc countries to spread subversion in Latin America. But, so far as we know, this is the first time the Argentine Government has openly stated that a Communist, or a Communist-type organization was about to make a bid to gain power. This substantiates recent reports and rumors that Castro's regime in Cuba, doubtless acting on instructions from both Moscow and Peking, is giving increased support to many leftwing extremists all over Latin America who are working to bring down their governments by violent action.

A recent BBC talk had some interesting things to say, for example, about what has been going on in Ecuador. There is apparently an organization there called "The Revolutionary Youth Movement," which is dedicated to using violence to take over the Government. As long ago as 1960 Castro was made its honorary president, and he has supplied it with weapons, money, and propaganda material. Several of its members have been trained in Cuba in guerrilla tactics. In January, this year, a police raid on its headquarters discovered firearms and materials for making bombs.

The "writing on the wall" could hardly be clearer. But, if further clarification is needed, it is to be found in a speech made by Castro to the Congress of the Women of the Americas in Havana in January. He categorically stated then that he was determined to encourage every movement aiming

to extend revolution by violence in Latin America. He said that he did not deny the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism, but it had not been possible in Cuba nor anywhere else in Latin America yet. Few statements could be more explicit.

Prize-Winning Orations by Two Oklahoma College Students

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include prize-winning orations by John Gilpin and Joe Dollins, representing two outstanding colleges in my district, Southeastern State College at Durant, Okla., and Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College at Wilburton, Okla., respectively.

The orations follow:

OUR DIVIDED WORLD

(By John Gilpin, Southeastern State College, Durant, Okla.)

The world, the whole world has never before been so completely divided because it has never before been so completely united. The obstacles which for years have prevented the close contact of men and nations have fallen to modern technology. Within a generation mankind has come to the threshold of unification and polarization. The human race has become a seamless whole, in which the murder of a Congolese chieftain sets off reverberations in the centers of world power thousands of miles away. And every day the whole is cut more deeply into two hostile halves.

But this division and conflict is not limited to our globe—for in the past 10 years outer space has become a field of competition between the two ideologies that divide the world. President Kennedy warned us of the danger of falling behind Russia after the single orbit flight of Russian Maj. Yuri Gagarin in 1961. The United States was still lagging behind when another Russian astronaut completed 17 orbits a few months later. But the United States regained a sensational amount of this loss when Col. John Glenn orbited around the earth three times in February 1962.

These successes intensified a race between the United States and Russia that will cost America and Russia over \$30 billion apiece in the next few years.

But these billions of dollars involved in the space race represent only a small part of the divided world's burden. The divided world so nearly united is also a poor world so nearly rich. Never before in the history of mankind has the possibility of a decent life for men everywhere been so real, yet it is so far away. Because as long as the deadly struggle between the East and the West is continued we can never hope to concentrate any of our effort on the homeless and starving people of the world.

Each day the struggle continues, the division is deepened. The entire world is being drawn into the division. Increasing pressure is being put on the neutrals from both sides. And the more they resist the greater the pressure becomes. They are beginning to realize that they must choose, and the choice will be final, between the East or the West.

This division of the world into two hostile halves is not new, in fact it is as old as history itself. But the known world was only

a very small part of the world at the time of Greece and Persia, Athens and Sparta, Rome and Carthage. But nevertheless there has always been a divided world of the rich and the poor, of those who owned and those who toiled. Plato echoed this theory in one of his works when he said that the city of the rich and the city of the poor would always be at war with each other.

The present world division may well be attributed to the attitudes accepted by the United States and Russia immediately after the Second World War. No historian places the entire blame for this division at the door of the Russians. Rightly or wrongly, a long string of provocations has been pointed at the Americans, the British, and the French in the partition of Germany. Regardless of this it is probable that a few weeks after the bombing of Hiroshima the Soviet Union would still have seen in the United States its mortal enemy. The United States was the genuinely successful capitalistic society, and America was now capable of producing a unique power for making war. More than that, the United States was now the only mainstay of the old capitalist empires.

Soon after the war the Communists returned to their goal of world revolution. They returned to the tactics laid down by their forefathers, Lenin and Marx, and they began their ruthless sweep through Eastern Europe. This reminded Western leadership of the revival of Communist imperialism. The violently reawakened Russian nationalism played upon the postwar chaos to create a buffer zone to defend the Soviet Union against the West. Also the West began to see the real picture of international communism and its aims.

The age-old theory of keeping a balance of power is out. Up to now it was accepted belief that maintaining a marginal balance of power over your enemy was sufficient. The new doctrine calls for absolute, and not marginal supremacy over your enemy. We must have this supreme edge over the Communists if we hope to contain the Russians in their present area, while maintaining our position at the pinnacle of world power. We started this policy 16 years ago and we are still following it today.

The United States will continue to strive for peace. But we are not alone in this task. The Communists since the end of World War II have been professing their desire for world peace. Of course, the objective of the Russians are much different than those of the United States. There is a popular anecdote in Washington and Moscow going around concerning this uneasy peace we are now in. A holy man was asked to inquire of God if there would be a war. After a suitable interval the holy man said he had done so and had been told by the Lord: "There will be no war, but the struggle for peace will be so furious that there shall not be left one stone upon another."

But I would ask: How can there be peace with two such colossal forces standing face to face in the world with nothing to restrain them? Never before in history has there been peace in a situation such as this.

While Hiroshima burned, President Truman told us "there must never be another war." War, at last, has become too horrible. But is peace humanly possible? Why not? Warring families have become tribal communities, warring tribes have become villages and then cities, and these city-states have been formed into nations. And in the last generation nations have combined into international communities. Within these large social organizations peace has always been the rule and war, revolutionary or civil war, the exception. There have been struggles between classes, races, and parties, but the community has always survived. Why then should there not be a community of the world within which violence could be

restrained as the national community. Although it would be extremely idealistic to contend that the world in its present condition could ever unite, isn't the only hope for world peace going to exist in world unification?

The dream of a world community is not new to men. In fact, the idea is as old as history itself. In early Grecian history the city-states of Athens and Sparta warred against each other for the power to rule over the known world. Later because of the influence of an outside force these nations united for mutual protection. As these nations, and other nations throughout history, have seen the need for unification we today must also realize this need.

Must man be made one before the world can be made one? This question is answered in the outstanding novel "The Brothers Karamazov" when its leading character says: "To transform the world, to re-create it afresh, men must turn into another path psychologically. Until you have become really, in actual fact, a brother to everyone, brotherhood will not come to pass. No sort of scientific teaching, no kind of common interest, will ever teach men to share."

MY UNCONQUERABLE SOUL

(By Joe Dollins, Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Wilburton, Okla.)

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever Gods may be,
For my unconquerable soul."

With these words, William Ernest Henley asserts his freedom. Freedom not from physical bondage, but rather mental enslavement. He magnifies the thought, "Individuality is freedom lived."

The initiative of individuals granted, not gave, literally gave to us the freedom under which we live. Why then doesn't individual initiative characterize our present day society?

I wonder what has happened to the bold American. You know, "give me liberty or give me death." When Patrick Henry made this familiar statement, I think he pleaded not only for his country, but also for himself. Perhaps that's just it. Because Patrick Henry and other men like him knew the horror of not having freedom of thought, they fought and gave this freedom to us.

Why don't we use this freedom? I think it's because like I said, others gave it to us; we haven't had to fight for it, therefore, we don't fully appreciate the privilege that is ours.

Justice Stanley Reed made the statement, "Without freedom of thought, there can be no free society." Since great individuals have given this freedom to us, I would say, "Without utilization of this freedom of thought, a free society cannot be maintained."

People, not individuals, but people say that the growing social pressure smothers their personality. That is a person's good reason for not being an individual, but their real reason is that they find under pressure, conformity is easier than individuality. What if Dorothea Dix had yielded to the conformed idea of the public toward mental illness? Where would our Nation be today if Mr. John F. Kennedy hadn't taken his firm stand on the Cuban crisis last October? As Emerson puts it, "Who so would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

The Creator seems to have given different people different ways of apprehending reality. Different personalities possess different insight into matters. This is the reason we as individuals must assert our view and be creative in the manner for which we were created, not conform to the activity for which a separate being was molded. A teacher of philosophy said it this way, "God created

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel Workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is far-seeing, a progressive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit error or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our cold increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

CUBA FAILURE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many of us have been reporting, from all over the country, to our colleagues and to members of the administration, the complete confusion on the part of the American public as to what we are doing or what we are not doing in terms of trying to regain for the Cuban people, themselves, the control of their own government.

I have been among those who have felt that the policy of indecision has been so extreme that we have been left in a position of failure insofar as concerns the protection of other countries in Central and South America. The prestige of the United States has gone down sharply. We must develop a policy which will afford some assurance of success over the next few years. Such policy should include a process of giving to the Cubans themselves the right to control their own government.

In the New York Post for April 11, a columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon, who is rather noted for his support of the present administration, wrote an analysis of the Cuban situation under the title of "Cuban Failure." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA FAILURE

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration's rupture with Jose Miro Cardona, coming on the second anniversary of the mismanaged Bay of Pigs invasion, brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance, and moral confusion in America's relations with the Cuban revolution. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor, and we have no policy nor recourse save to wait for whatever good or bad tidings the future

may bring. Events have passed out of our hands.

It is instructive to recall the state of affairs when Mr. Kennedy took office. Castro, having been in power for 2 years, had already aligned himself with the Communists, broken with the liberal elements in the revolutionary coalition, and was far advanced in transforming an indigenous radical uprising into a self-shackled Communist dependent.

A brave and active underground movement against the dictator was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow. The United States which had encouraged Batista to depart and which had originally extended a sympathetic tolerance to the Castro government, was in a strong position to influence the course of events, both in its own national interest and in the interest of the freedom of the Cuban people. There were then no Soviet troops and no short-range Soviet missiles in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration took office seemingly committed to a clear and sound policy that this country would not permit a Communist Cuba. Since the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the United States had taken the consistent position that we would not allow foreign countries to establish new colonies or export alien systems of government to this hemisphere. Since Castro had turned out to be only a stalking horse for the Communists, we had no alternatives except to force his departure or compromise our historic position.

There were only two ways to get rid of Castro. One was to organize a mixed invasion of Cubans and Americans under the aegis of a government-in-exile which we would recognize. The other was to organize sabotage, political subversion and economic pressure. This program could only have succeeded if the administration had been willing to make bold political decisions. In a revolutionary situation, the most effective alternative is usually a group only a shade less radical than the faction one is trying to overthrow. What was wanted was a political leadership for the Cuban underground-and-exile movement that shared most of Castro's original radical social and economic program but disavowed his terrorism and his links to Moscow. We shall never know if a left-of-center alternative, properly supported by the United States, could have brought Castro down. The President and his brother, Robert and their CIA and State Department advisers lacked the political sophistication and imagination to attempt it.

President Kennedy chose the more direct alternative of an invasion. Since the Cuban exiles ranged from radicals to reactionaries, a temporary coalition was pasted together under the presidency of Miro Cardona, an honorable man of centrist sympathies. But this coalition was not recognized as a government in exile. The administration also held back from providing the U.S. troops and planes necessary to bolster the exile force. Moreover, the CIA, with extraordinary political obtuseness, placed most of its reliance on the sons of the wealthy and on the supporters of the fallen Batista. In short, the White House policymakers avoided the political choices and the CIA made the wrong ones.

There was nothing wrong, in my judgment, with a mixed Cuban-and-American military intervention to throw out Castro except that once embarked upon, it could not be allowed to fail. President Kennedy did allow it to fail.

But there was no reason, after that single defeat, for panic or despair. The political alternative could still be attempted, although now under less favorable circumstances, or a second successful invasion could be properly planned and carried out. Instead, the administration did nothing. The 18 wasted months from April 1961 to October 1962, are

in my opinion, a worse offense on the administration's record than the defeat of the Bay of Pigs invasion. What had appeared to be a firm resolve to get rid of Castro proved, after only one setback, to be made of jelly.

The only conclusion drawn from the events of April 1961, was that clandestine operations are impossible in a democracy. The exiles and the underground were simply written off as too divided and unmanageable. Micawberism—"Maybe something will turn up"—reigned.

What turned up were the Russian missiles. Khrushchev had not wasted those 18 months. Mr. Kennedy was able to force the Russians to withdraw the missiles by going to the edge of nuclear war. We are all grateful to him that his resolute firmness in October succeeded, but he is scarcely entitled to any credit for handling Cuban affairs in such a way that they produced a nuclear crisis. The introduction of the Soviet missiles completely exposed the shallowness of those, in the administration and in the general public, who thought we could happily co-exist with a Communist Cuba. Because we permitted Castro to stay in power, Khrushchev very nearly outflanked us on our defenseless southern border.

The long-range missiles are presumably gone, but Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was 2 years ago. We cannot get rid of Castro because his safety has now become linked with Khrushchev's prestige. Cuba has become like Berlin, a hostage in the cold war. The suppression of the Cuban raiders and the dropping of poor Miro Cardona constitute the final admission that we have met total defeat on the Cuban front. The Cuban people have been left to the mercies of their bearded tyrant.

DEATH OF DR. A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, PRESIDENT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, died on Friday, April 19, at New Haven, Conn. I knew him, served under him as a member of the Yale Council, respected him and held him in deep affection. But there are thousands of Yale students and graduates, members of the faculty, associates in the profession of teaching, and people in every walk of life who came in association with him, who were moved by his teachings and writings, and who felt his influence. His influence in thought and action moved far beyond the confines of Yale University, and had its bearing upon our Nation.

He has been described as an eloquent defender of academic freedom—and that description is correct. He was a strong believer in the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy, and therefore he was not fearful of academic freedom, and freedom of inquiry throughout our Nation. He defended freedom, and advocated it, courageously and joyfully.

There is so much that he said to choose from, but I would like to quote the following:

The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

to our advantage to have a government, whatever its form, that is hostile to the Communist bloc and friendly to the West.

We have helped to knock out Diefenbaker, weaken Macmillan, jar De Gaulle, and to be indifferent to Adenauer. Ultra leftwingers of our country want Franco of Spain and Salazar of Portugal eliminated, even though they are friendly to the cause of the West. We helped in the eradication of Batista and the establishment of Castro. As between Batista, who was friendly to the West, and Castro, who is hostile to it, it would have been far better for the Western Hemisphere and the people of the world to have continued Batista in power.

Finally, if we are to continue destroying our friends, our problems will grow more dangerous as time goes on. This we cannot endure. Manifestly, if we are to serve the best interest of our country, we must quit insulting and quit weakening the nations which wish to be friendly to our cause.

THE ADVOCATES OF FISCAL INTEGRITY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently many of us who have been discussing the need for fiscal integrity in this country and for reducing the unnecessary spending at the present level have been accused of having old-fashioned Puritan ethics and outmoded concepts of government. We have been told that the only way to move the country forward is to spend more of the people's money that we do not have and will not have for many, many years to come.

Recently, Mr. President, I came on a very thoughtful and entertaining article, published in the Wall Street Journal, which comments on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1963]

How To PICK A POCKET or Two

To a smalltown fellow come to the big city it was bound to happen sooner or later, and finally it did. On the way to Wall Street, that den of iniquity, our pocket was pieked in the subway, that haunt of the huddled masses.

Along with a couple of credit cards, an unfilled prescription for the drug store, and a shopping list from the lady of the house, this skillful disciple of Fagin made off with \$100, which for years we've kept secreted in the back of our wallet against such grave emergencies as running out of expense-account money in San Antonio or St. Paul.

Now being imbued with a Puritan ethic, we do not approve of pickpockets, especially those who pick our own. But in all honesty we must confess that purely from the standpoint of the Nation's economic balance sheet there was no net loss to the country. Indeed, if some of the economic theories bruited about today are correct, it could be argued that the Nation's economy had been helped thereby.

For our loss of \$100 was somebody else's gain of \$100, the one canceling out the other insofar as economic statistics are concerned. Furthermore, since there was a transfer of funds from one party to another there was a

gain in the gross national product as well as the national income. The fact that we paid an exorbitant price for the service received; namely, a lesson in personal finance management—is no concern in abstract economics.

Finally, we suspect the unknown artist of the subway is less well endowed with worldly goods than we are, less likely to keep the money out of circulation as idle savings for a rainy day. So this transfer of our funds to his pocket probably resulted in an increase in the Nation's consumer spending.

Whatever our personal feelings, then, the result represents a consummation devoutly to be wished by the influential thinkers of the day. The whole object of current economic policy is to increase the transfer of funds, raising the statistics of national income and the gross national product, and especially such transfers of funds as may increase consumer spending. The sociological objective is called the "redistribution of income."

Hence the great emphasis on Government spending, which has gotten to be a large part of the gross national product. There's no surer and more efficient way to transfer huge sums than to take taxes from citizens of, say, New York and spend them in New Mexico or Mississippi. According to this thinking, it's a further help if the dollars can be transferred from corporations and rich folk, who might have a proclivity toward savings, to the hands of those who will inject it more quickly into the spending stream.

We are told that the good effects of all this are enhanced if the Government, unlike our friend on the subway, can spend more than it takes or at least seem to. Big deficits, especially those arising from tax cuts, allow more dollars to be put in some people's pockets without appearing to take quite so much out of other people's pockets.

True, this is illusory; what the Government spends it must take away from somebody in some form. Nonetheless, there's no denying it's less painful to steal a bit from everybody's dollars by inflation than to take the money away from them in immediate taxes.

On the subway we had a blissful ignorance of being plucked until, much later in the day, we found ourselves less well off than we thought. And even now we think there must be many a helpful pickpocket who wishes that policemen understood the ethics of the new economics.

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, over a period of years we have been told by many persons that the liberals have the only true concept of government and are the only ones who understand what government is all about, and that somehow or other all conservatives are but a few centuries ahead of Louis XIV, and that is about all.

I hold in my hand an entertaining article, published on April 22 in the Washington Star, which goes quite clearly into the concept of liberals in government and what they are trying to avow, insofar as the concept of government is concerned. It seems to me the article is both timely and extremely pertinent to many of the debates in the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS—SOME ACCUSED OF CHAMPIONING LIBERTY WHILE FAVORING CREEPING COERCION

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled liberals are generally nicer people than sour-puss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgoing liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tell you to a post, pry open our jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

Willie Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square.

"Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer. "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the liberal formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-do's that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninety percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for \$20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enough social legislation.

Approved For Release 2004/08/26 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200250013-1

UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DDCI 7D6011	4/24/63 1705	4/27/63 C
2	DCI 7D5607		HC
3	<i>Legislative Counsel 7D01</i>		JW
4			
5			
6			
ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN	
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE	
Remarks:			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE

Approved For Release 2004/08/26 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200250013-1

UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
--------------	--------------	--------

FORM NO. 237 Use previous editions (40)
2-61